

and children in Uganda during the recent conflict there. Girls and women in Uganda are traded back and forth, bartered as wives. Their allocation is part of a dehumanizing reward system for male soldiers. This crime addresses a theme of ownership which precludes women's sexual rights and brings to light the brutalization of Ugandan women. Rape within "marriage" is not construed as a crime in Uganda, or for that matter, in many countries which consistently violate women's rights. When intra-marriage rape is condoned within a society, this neglect is one of several factors leading to a normalization of domestic violence.

Sexual discrimination and power are especially apparent in Uganda as girls who are forcibly married are required to cook for the soldiers as they are on the move and are severely beaten or killed should they not cook quickly enough. Both girls and boys are forced to kill other children who have not performed their tasks to a sufficient level. Captive boys are often forced to sleep with captive girls, and this sexual indoctrination has terrible ramifications for future sexual violence. The nightmare in Uganda demonstrates the importance of taking into account the sexual specificity of violence. We should recognize how sexual violence harms both girls and boys, women and men.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most horrible examples of gender-based violence against women and children is female genital mutilation (FGM). FGM refers to either the removal of certain parts of the female genitalia or all of it. FGM is a crime against humanity—it violates a woman's fundamental right to a healthy life. Nearly 135 million girls and women around the world have undergone FGM, and it continues at an astounding rate of approximately 6,000 incidents per day. It is practiced extensively in Africa, in the Middle East, and among many immigrant communities in parts of Asia and the Pacific.

FGM is an extremely painful and even dangerous procedure which scars women both physically and mentally for life. FGM is an example of how violence is connected to gender determination as a woman is often considered "incomplete" lest she undergo FGM. A woman is not treated as a specific individual, rather she is a sexual being whose sexuality, sexual appetite, and reproductive functions are supposedly controlled and limited through FGM. In the case of FGM, we are forced to deal with brutal cultural discrimination against women. Women who have undergone FGM have publicly come forward to present their stories of humiliation and pain.

Crimes specific to women, Mr. Speaker, often revolve around religious and cultural justifications that seem inevitable to discriminate against the female gender rather than the male. In Afghanistan, which has endured 18 years of armed conflict, we are witnessing a tragic situation in which thousands of women are literally prohibited from leaving their homes. They must be "invisible;" they are denied their humanity. Women are forced to wear a robe which completely covers their bodies, the *burqa* robe. Should women expose their ankles, they are accused of violating the Taliban, the interpretation of the Shari's (Islamic law) based upon the teaching of Islamic schools in Pakistan. The restrictions upon Afghani women are a shocking violation of human rights based upon culturally determined ideas of gender.

Mr. Speaker, we must not become desensitized to violence against women. It is the responsibility of every state to preserve the human rights of women and to protect them against violence. Violence against women is not a private matter. In far too many countries—unfortunately, including our own—it is a structural and system-wide violation of human rights of women. States that do not prevent and punish crimes of domestic violence are as guilty as the perpetrators of that violence. Inaction against domestic violence reinforces the denial of basic human rights.

Domestic or family violence is a commonplace occurrence in nearly every country in the world, and battered women are isolated from national systems of justice, as well as from community and family. Intimate partners are prosecuted less harshly than those who victimize strangers, and this pattern of neglect for women's rights is evident in many corners of the world. In Brazil, some courts still exonerate men accused of domestic violence if they acted "to defend their honor." South African justice officers do not wish to be involved in domestic violence; they consider it a "private" affair. Not only are women subjected to acts of violence, but they are also subjected to judicial establishments which systematically are involved in gender-specific violation of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, the harmful perceptions of domestic violence are magnified in the case of rape. Rape is widely portrayed as an individual act and a private crime of honor, not as the political use of violence. Since World War II, however, human rights organizations estimate that there have been one million women raped during wars. Rape in war has been obscured from public view by our assumptions about the hyper masculine nature of soldiering and of rape as a crime of sex rather than a crime of violence.

This past week, Dragoljub Kunarac, a former Bosnian Serb paramilitary commander, confessed that he had raped Muslim women in an international legal process before the Yugoslav war crimes tribunal in The Hague. He is the first individual to plead guilty to rape as a war crime. The Hague is the first court of its kind to specifically list rape and other sexual offenses as war crimes. The international women's movement has seldom been so effective in alerting the world to crimes against women as it has been in calling to international attention the brutal use of rape during the armed conflict in Bosnia.

Rape is an especially under-reported and minimized assault on women. It is "the least condemned war crime; throughout history, the rape of hundreds of thousands of women and children in all regions of the world has been a bitter reality," according to the UN Special Rapporteur of Violence Against Women. We must not cease our efforts to identify gender-specific violence against women in such situations.

Rape has been used to brutalize, to dehumanize, and to humiliate civilian populations on ethnic, national, political, and religious grounds. Sexual violence was defined by many analysts as a genocidal act in the Yugoslavian conflict because it was perpetrated primarily by Bosnian-Serbs as a weapon in their effort to drive out the Muslim population. Some Muslims were told while being raped that they would bear Serbian children.

During the 1994 genocide in Africa, Hutu militia in Rwanda subjected the Tutsi minority

women to gender-based violence on a mass scale as they raped and sexually assaulted hundreds of thousands of women. In another instance of human rights violation, Pakistani soldiers committed ethnically-motivated mass rapes during the Bangladesh war for independence.

It is an outrage that rape is still categorized by many as a crime of honor and property as opposed to a crime against personal physical integrity. This misconception adds to the false notion that rape is a "lesser" crime in comparison to torture. Women are denied their individual humanity and instead perceived by the aggressor as a symbol of the enemy community that can be humiliated, violated, and eradicated.

This year we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), but we should not overlook the fact that the human rights of women were not specifically affirmed by the United Nations until 1993. Before this time, the gender-specific nature of many of the crimes against women were often ignored.

By recognizing that violence is often specific to gender and by acknowledging the ways in which violence relates to our conceptions of gender, we can illuminate the barriers that we must transcend to achieve equal rights for women. The pervasive forms of violence that are normalized and trivialized by culture and society must not be tolerated as we affirm the human rights of women on this International Day of Women.

Mr. Speaker, the rights of all humans are unalienable rights. We must stand firm in our belief that all—women, as well as men—have an individual right to dignity and that our own rights are not assured unless the human rights of all others on this planet are secure. I urge my colleagues to join me in this fight for human rights for all women.

I commend to my colleagues the words of Pastor Martin Niemöller, who endured the horrors of Nazi Germany: "In Germany they came first for the Communists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Communist. Then they came for the Jews, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Jew. Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak up because I was a Protestant. Then they came for me, and by that time no one was left to speak up."

Mr. Speaker, the violation of the human rights of any woman is the violation of the rights of all of us. As we mark International Women's Day, we must recommit ourselves to that struggle.

#### INTRODUCING THE COLLEGE TUITION REDUCTION AND INFORMATION ACT OF 1997

**HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1998

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the College Tuition Reduction and Information Act. Almost a year ago I, along with the Gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODLING, and a bipartisan list of cosponsors, introduced the Cost of Higher Education Review Act of 1997. At that time, it was clear to

us that college was too expensive and that college price increases were threatening the ability of American families to provide for their children's education. That legislation, which has since been enacted, established a National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education. The job of the Commission was to evaluate why tuitions have increased to two-to-three times the rate of inflation every year, and to advise Congress and the President on steps which could be taken to bring college prices under control.

The Commission has since finished its work and gone out of existence. The legislation we are introducing today will implement a number of the recommendations of the Commission. Specifically, this legislation will provide students and parents with better information to keep colleges accountable and higher education affordable by requiring the Secretary of Education to work with institutions to develop a clear set of standards for reporting college costs and prices. Under out bill, the Secretary of Education will redesign the collection of Federal information on college costs and prices to make it more useful and timely to the public.

The College Tuition Reduction and Information Act will allow students to make more informed choices about the level of education they pursue by requiring the Secretary of Education to collect separate data on the cost and price of both undergraduate and graduate education. It will help parents and students make informed decisions about the school they choose by requiring the Secretary of Education to make available for all schools on a yearly basis information on tuition, price, and the relationship between tuition increases and increases in institutional costs. It will also allow us to keep track of any progress made in reducing tuitions by requiring the United States General Accounting Office to issue a yearly report on college cost and tuition increases.

This legislation will reduce the costs imposed on colleges through unnecessary or overly burdensome federal regulation by requiring the Secretary of Education to undertake a thorough review of regulations regarding student financial assistance every two years, and were possible repeal, consolidate, or simplify those regulations. The Secretary will also report to Congress any recommendations he has with regard to legislative changes which would allow increased regulatory simplification. Our bill will allow colleges and universities to offer voluntary early retirement packages to tenured professors, and it will require the General Accounting Office to report to Congress on the extent to which unnecessary costs are being imposed on colleges and universities as a result of holding them to the same Federal regulations that are applied in industrial settings. We expect colleges and universities to pass these savings on to students.

This legislation will keep college affordable by ensuring that every American has simpler, more efficient access to higher education by bringing the delivery of Federal student financial assistance into the 21st century and by strengthening Federal support for innovative projects addressing issues of productivity, efficiency, quality improvement, and cost control at postsecondary institutions.

Tomorrow, under the leadership of Chairman GOODLING, the Committee on Education

and Workforce will consider the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. A few of the provisions I am introducing today have already been incorporated into that legislation. I will be offering the remainder of them as an amendment to that legislation early in the markup.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring that a quality postsecondary education remains affordable is one of the most important things we can do for our children and for American families everywhere.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and to cosponsor the College Tuition Reduction and Information Act.

#### EMPTY SHELVES: 1998 SURVEY OF U.S. FOOD BANKS

**HON. TONY P. HALL**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1998*

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues' attention an informal survey I recently made of 60 food banks from across the nation. Their responses point clearly to the fact that food banks throughout our country are facing tremendous challenges. Despite our booming economy, demand is rising at surprising rates in most communities.

Here in Congress, most of the talk about hunger has focused on welfare and the reform bill that we passed in 1996. But when you leave Washington, the focus shifts to the food banks. That's where hungry people turn when they've run out of options, and it's where the millions of Americans who regularly donate to canned food drives send their support.

The food banks are in trouble. I am not here to rehash welfare reform, Mr. Speaker, and I was surprised that most food banks aren't interested in doing that either. As the food bank in Montgomery, Alabama put it, "We are doing our best to meet the need, and we think in the end we will help make welfare reform work." A lot of food banks expressed similar optimism, and I share their hope. I think all of us do.

Of all the ways we can make welfare reform work, food is the least expensive one. Job training, transportation to get to a job, child care, health care—these are all pricey investments. Food is an investment too—although some people talk as if food is like a carrot you dangle in front of a mule to make it go where you want it to go. That might work with animals, but it simply doesn't work with people.

Hunger makes people tired. It saps their spirit and drive. It robs them of the concentration they need to learn job skills. It forces them to focus on where the next few meals are coming from—instead of on finding a job, or holding one. And it makes them prone to get sick, from every flu bug that comes around, on up to some very serious diseases.

When Congress enacted welfare reform, we increased federal support for food banks by \$100 million—but the money inserted into the gap between need and supply is falling far short. We originally took away \$23 billion from food stamp recipients. But we gave just \$100 million to food banks. With that, they are struggling to provide just a few days worth of emergency food to the people who've lost their food stamps, or whose food stamps don't last the entire month. It's just not enough.

It made common sense to increase our support for food banks significantly, and we did just that. With evidence that this still falls impossibly short of what is needed—and that many food banks simply cannot make it without more support—it makes common sense to revisit the decision on the appropriate amount of additional support.

This survey of food banks adds to the evidence of booming demands on food banks. It is not designed to be a statistical analysis. But it does provide perspective from around the country—a window on what is happening in communities of every size.

What I found most striking overall is that, of the food banks that estimated the increase in demand for food, 70% reported demand grew much faster than 16%. That is the rate reported in a December 1997 survey by the U.S. Conference of Mayors that shocked me, and many other Americans. And yet so many food banks are reporting even higher rates. I think it underscores the fact that poverty reaches beyond our cities. It scars rural communities and suburban ones too—a fact that many people overlook when they conjure in their minds the image of a welfare mom, or a food stamp recipient, or someone in line at the local food pantry.

Beyond that, the story of hunger in America that the food banks are documenting is an individual one. It increasingly features working people, whose low-wage jobs don't pay enough to put food on the table. Often, it includes people for whom hunger is a symptom of deeper problems—of illiteracy, a lack of education, a history of substance or domestic abuse. But equally often it includes people who are trying to climb out of their problems, trying to improve their prospects and willing to participate in initiatives aimed at giving them the tools they need. And, when the story includes a food bank, it always features people doing the Lord's work—and in increasingly creative ways. The survey describes some of those approaches, and I think many of them deserve attention and praise.

The food banks, and the hungry people who are doing their best to escape poverty, cannot do it alone. We need a range of initiatives to fill the gaps, and I will be using this survey to support my work on at least three ideas: First, and most immediately, the food banks need more money. I am working on a bill now, but the fact is that even millions of dollars would be a small investment in making sure that welfare reform succeeds. I'm also looking into including the President's request for \$20 million to support gleaning initiatives, because food banks rely heavily on gleaned food.

Second, we need to end the tax law's discrimination against charitable donations from farmers and businesses who want to donate food. Current law says the value of food is nothing more than the cost of its ingredients—which already are deducted as a cost of doing business.

That means it makes no difference to the green eyeshades in "Accounting" whether the food is donated or dumped. In fact, it costs a few pennies more to donate the food (in transportation or labor costs). The same is true for farmers: why not plow under unsold crops, if it costs you time or money to donate them instead? Many businesses and farmers donate food anyway—but many more probably would if we treat food as a charitable donation, in the same way that old clothes and other donated goods are treated.